

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11, 15 and 16 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended, no claims are cancelled or added. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS--35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/165894 A1 ("Kashani"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11, and 15-16 are patentable over *Kashani* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

"A multi-function peripheral device comprising:
a network interface configured to allow the multi-function peripheral device to communicate with network devices over a network;
a graphical user interface configured to allow for the exchange of information between the multi-function peripheral device and a user, wherein the information comprises configuration data for a virus protection process that includes attributes that the user specifies to configure the virus protection process;
one or more processors;
a memory;
a scan process configured to scan one or more documents at the multi-function peripheral device;
a print process configured to print one or more documents at the multi-function peripheral device; and
the virus protection process executing in the memory and being configured to perform the steps of:

examine data stored on non-volatile memory of the multi-function peripheral device based upon the configuration data for the virus protection process;
based on examining the data, detect that one or more unauthorized instructions are stored on the non-volatile memory of the multi-function peripheral device; and
in response to detecting that the one or more unauthorized instructions have been stored on the non-volatile memory of the multi-function peripheral device:
perform one or more actions to address the one or more unauthorized instructions that have been stored on the non-volatile memory of the multi-function peripheral device based upon the configuration data for the virus protection process.” (emphasis added)

At least the above-bolded elements of Claim 1 are not anticipated by *Kashani*. Claim 1 recites “**a graphical user interface configured to allow for the exchange of information between the multi-function peripheral device and a user, wherein the information comprises configuration data for a virus protection process that includes attributes that the user specifies to configure the virus protection process**”. The Office Action asserts that *Kashani* anticipates this limitation. More specifically, the Office Action cites paragraphs 54, 64 “office environment”, 67, 117, figure 7 “general self administration model”. (*Office Action*, p. 3). However, each of the cited sections fail to anticipate the limitation, namely “configuration data for a virus protection process.” Paragraphs [0054] and [0064] discuss a GUI and a standard user interface used with the “office environment.” Paragraph [0067] discusses the option of executing tasks in parallel or sequentially, and immediately or according to a predetermined time so as to function as a virtual user or digital clone of the user. Paragraph [0117] discusses security of the system by stating methods of authentication of a user that only allows a user to access a computer system, not specify configuration data for a virus protection process. In any case, each of these cited sections fail to anticipate “**configuration data for a virus protection process that**

includes attributes that the user specifies to configure the virus protection process...”.

Configuring the virus protection process by specifying attributes for the virus protection process creates distinct advantages as this allows the user to configure the virus protection process. The user, for example, may specify which data is to be checked and which actions to take after virus detection. *Written Specification*, [0037]. Thus, at least one limitation has not been anticipated by *Kashani*.

Claim 1 further recites **“based on examining the data, detect that one or more unauthorized instructions are stored on the non-volatile memory of the multi-function peripheral device.”** The Office Action states that this limitation is anticipated by paragraphs [0120] and [0121] in *Kashani*. In *Kashani*, the “anti-virus protection 842 which is a constantly updated device which scans *documents for viruses as information enters invention 10.*” (emphasis added) (*Kashani*, par. [0120]). No where is it mentioned that the virus protection process **“detect[s] that one or more unauthorized instructions are stored on the non-volatile memory”**. *Kashani* scans *only documents* for viruses, not data. Data is recited in Claim 1, is **“data ... based upon the configuration data for the virus protection process”**. Types of data may include “data files, programs, configuration data, or all data on MFP 100” (*Written Specification*, par [0037]). Thus, unauthorized instructions may come from any of these data types and the virus protection process detects these unauthorized instructions. There is nothing analogous to unauthorized instructions that may be detected in *Kashani*.

In addition, Paragraph [0121] states that a document with a virus may be placed in quarantine. Claim 1 recites **“perform one or more actions to address the one or more unauthorized instructions that have been stored on the non-volatile memory of the multi-function peripheral device based upon the configuration data for the virus protection**

process.” Claim 1 allows one or more actions to address discovered unauthorized instructions. These actions may include restoring data changed by a virus to a prior state or to quarantine or delete data affected by a virus. *Written Specification*, [0028]. Whatever action performed is “based upon the configuration data for the virus protection process.” *Kashani*, however, is far more limiting as only quarantining is performed automatically with each further action requiring a user action. “[Q]uarantine 848 which is an area designed to store documents which are unchecked or failed to pass through Checkpoint 812, perhaps due to the presence of a virus... User 600 is required to take individual action on a per-document basis to clear items from quarantine 848.” *Kashani*, [0121].

Taking individual action on a per-document basis is not actions based upon configuration data. Specifying the action to be performed in a configuration data creates an advantage as some users may wish to repair the infected file by restoring the data to a prior state rather than performing a quarantine or deletion of the file that may cause adverse effects to the function of the MFP. *Written Specification*, [0028]. Also, specifying actions in a configuration data allows these actions to occur automatically, and not on a per-document basis, saving time.

As at least one element of Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by *Kaneko*, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art and is in condition for allowance.

CLAIMS 2-3, 8-9, 11, AND 15-16

Claims 2-3, 8-9, 11, and 15-16 are dependent claims, each of which depends directly on Claim 1 discussed above, and thus include each and every feature of the corresponding independent Claim. Each of Claims 2-3, 8-9, 11, and 15-16 is therefore allowable for the reasons

given above for Claim 1. In addition, each of Claims 2-3, 8-9, 11, and 15-16 introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time, although the Applicants reserve the right to further point out the differences between the cited art and the novel features recited in the dependent claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-3, 8-9, 11, and 15-16 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: 7/30/08

/RobertSChee#58554/
Robert S. Chee
Reg. No. 58,554

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1083
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1213
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076